



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 September 2025

by **A.Graham BA(hons) MAued IHBC**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/U5360/D/25/3368883

8 Southgate Grove, Hackney, London N1 5BT

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by K Hense against the decision of London Borough of Hackney Council.
 - The application Ref is 2025/0594.
 - The application is for part single/part two storey rear and side extension including alteration to existing window to rear elevation and erection of solar panels to extension roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for part single/part two storey rear and side extension including alteration to existing window to rear elevation and erection of solar panels to extension roof as per application reference 2025/0594 subject to the conditions as set out in the schedule below.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of development above is taken from the Council's Decision Notice and differs slightly from that used on the Appellant's original application form. However, I consider that the description above most effectively conveys the description of the development proposed and as such I have used it in that regard.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the De Beauvoir Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is Neo Classical townhouse with the appeal property being the end house of a terrace of four. The row of buildings here is relatively grand and exhibit a double gable front elevation whereby the two sets of adjoining houses present a double pedimented frontage onto Southgate Grove. The terrace is Locally Listed and I consider it a positive building within the De Beauvoir Conservation Area (CA).
5. Southgate Grove itself is a residential street that sits at right angles to the main Southgate Road where there are several commercial and residential properties. The area contains other such Neo Classically inspired residential housing including a near identical row of four pedimented houses that are largely exemplars of the speculative housing developments undertaken in the 19th century and that form a key component of the CA. To the opposite side of the appeal site, farther along

Southgate Grove, there is a much later slab block of flats from the later 20th century known as Gate House. This building is of three modern storeys and has side windows facing towards the appeal site which lies immediately to the west.

6. The appeal site therefore exhibits strong Neo Classical features including its pedimented roof form, carved string courses and windows with a classical architrave surround. The principal floor of the house is elevated around half a storey above street level with a flight of steps giving access to the front door. Unusually the classical features associated with the pediment and the front door protrude rather far over the end of the house as if continuing the terrace and this gives the side elevation a particularly blank appearance in contrast.
7. Being the end terrace the appeal site has access down its side and this gives a way into the rear garden where there is a basement level extension of an obviously contextual modern design whereby traditional motifs are contrasted with modern areas of glazing, render and slot windows.
8. The proposal before me seeks permission to effectively extend this existing rear extension both upwards and to the side, thereby bringing the extension beyond the end elevation of the terrace. With the extension currently being on a basement level, the extension would not extend very far above the existing ground floor ceiling height and would effectively raise up one and half storeys above the street level and a full two storeys above the level of the rear garden.
9. The extension would therefore slightly extend the existing lower floor living space but would include the addition of a new bedroom above. This extra space would be accommodated through the protrusion of the extension to the side although this would be very well set back from the front elevation and largely obscured for much of the time due to the presence of a tree, that I believe is evergreen, that sits in the front garden. The extension would however result in the dramatic reduction of the existing staircase window and would construct a high brick wall along the boundary with Gate House.
10. In considering whether to grant planning permission I am required by Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to give 'Special Attention' to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the De Beauvoir Conservation Area. The statutory duties within the Act are reflected in The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), which states that 'Great Weight' should be given to the heritage assets' conservation and also illustrates the positive contribution that heritage assets can make to the creation of sustainable and economically viable communities.
11. These requirements are also reflected in policies D3, HC1 and D4 of The London Plan 2021 and policies LP1, LP3 and LP4 of the Hackney Local Plan 2033 which seek to manage change in the historic environment and ensure good design along with the management of Non Designated Heritage Assets.
12. The De Beauvoir Conservation Area represents an area of former estate land that was later developed as a smart residential area notable for its Mock Tudor and Jacobean inspired architecture that was later followed by Neo Classical Victorian speculative housing development. Many of the houses exhibit Italianate designs and were likely developed by different groups of builders working from pattern books.

13. The scheme before me would see a modest side extension of which the Council have significant concerns. Although the Conservation Area Appraisal seeks to avoid large side extensions, the scheme before me would see only a modest protrusion beyond the end elevation of the house. It would also appear to be single storey from the front at least and would be set very far back from the front elevation of the property. Bearing in mind the large tree to the front of the property I consider that any visual impact upon the street frontage would be extremely limited.
14. Although the extension would protrude and very slightly alter the generally symmetrical nature of the row of four houses here, it would not represent such harm either to the Locally Listed Building, nor to the character or appearance of the Conservation Area because of this. Whilst I find it regrettable that the rear stair window could not be retained in this scheme this alone is not sufficient enough for me to dismiss on this basis, especially in light of the lack of objection from the Council.
15. As such, I find that the proposal would meet the requirements of policies D3, HC1 and D4 of The London Plan 2021 and policies LP1, LP3 and LP4 of the Hackney Local Plan 2033 and that the character and appearance of the Conservation Area would be preserved.

Other Matter

16. Several neighbours raised objections with regards the effect of the proposal upon the living conditions of those at Gate House who feel that the proposed extension would be over dominant and spoil the enjoyment of their living spaces and communal garden through over shadowing and over dominance.
17. The garden of Gate House does appear to be on a slightly lower level than that of the appeal site and the proposal would in effect create an unarticulated wall directly upon this common boundary that would extend to around 5 metres in height. Whilst the Council do not object to this issue, I saw on my site visit that the gap between Gate House and the appeal site is important and that the orientation does make any intervention here worthy of attention.
18. Although I saw that the existing outlook of residents at Gate House is currently one of foliage and not a wall I have had due regard to the assessments made by the Appellants in their Design and Access Statement that indicates that the 45 degree rule would be met even with a higher scheme. The proposal before me would lessen this impact further through its design and as such would more comfortably meet the guidance for daylight.
19. In light of this I consider that, whilst there may be some short term change to this boundary through the building of a brick wall, there would not be any adverse overshadowing and any increased dominance of this structure upon this boundary would be mitigated by the distance between the appeal site and the windows of Gate House. As such I concur with the Council that there would be no significant harm to the living conditions of residents here so as to lead me to a different conclusion.

Conditions

20. The Council have suggested inclusion of the usual conditions to control the timescale of implementation of development, the materials to be used and the need to conform to the plans as submitted as part of this application. I have no reason to add more conditions.

Conclusion

21. In conclusion, the proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the De Beauvoir Conservation Area and, having regard to the findings above, I allow the appeal.

A Graham

INSPECTOR

Schedule of Conditions

- i) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
- ii) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
- iii) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: PL-01 Site Location/Block Plan, PL100 Existing and Proposed Lower Ground Floor plans, PL101 Existing and Proposed Ground Floor Plans, PL102 Existing and Proposed First Floor Plans, PL103 Existing and Proposed Roof Plans, PL200 Existing and Proposed Section AA, PL201 Existing and Proposed Section BB, PL300 Existing and Proposed Front Elevation, PL301 Existing and Proposed Side Elevation, and PL302 Existing and Proposed Rear Elevations.